

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 7-21 are all the claims pending in the application.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting a telephonic interview with Applicant's attorney on November 30, 2005. The following is a statement of the substance of the interview. During the interview, claims 1 and 14 were discussed and Applicant's attorney argued that several limitations were not in the cited references. Specifically, since the Examiner conceded in the Office Action that Otsuki and Eble failed to disclose the collection and display of statistical information, the discussion focused on the Alexander patent. Applicant's attorney told the Examiner that Alexander failed to disclose any display of statistical information. The Examiner agreed that Alexander failed to disclose these limitations. However, the Examiner reserved the right to perform additional prior art searches.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objects to claims 1 and 7-21 as allegedly containing "typing-errors" which make "reading difficult." Applicant has reviewed these claims and is unable to identify any errors in the claims and requests that the Examiner specifically identify the errors or withdraw the claim objections.

35 U.S.C. § 112, 1ST PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claims 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph as allegedly being non enabled because the limitations "a preference of a user," "a first visual

indication,” and “a second visual indication,” are allegedly not found in the specification.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses these rejections.

Specifically, the Examiner is referred to at least page 18, line 3 through page 19, line 19 and figures 4 and 6, which provide full and complete support for claim limitations “a preference of a user,” “a first visual indication,” and “a second visual indication.” For example, page 18, lines 4-6 state “The user can select which and how program cells are to be displayed, in an All-at-Glance EPG which will be described below.” In addition, examples of “visual indications” include a shape, pattern and color. See page 19, lines 9-11 and figures 4 and 6. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicant requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections be withdrawn.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otsuki in view of Eble and further in view of Alexander. Applicant traverses these rejections because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. Specifically, at least the following limitations are not disclosed or suggested:

Claim 1:

a displaying device for displaying said generated program guide on a two-dimensional screen;

an accepting device for accepting a designation of an area including at least two of said program cells on said displayed program guide; and

a collecting device for collecting statistics on a predetermined program attribute for at least one program corresponding to at least one of said program cells included in said designated area,

wherein said a displaying device displays said designated predetermined area and said statistics.

Claim 13:

displaying said generated program guide on a two-dimensional screen;
accepting a designation of an area including at least two of said program cells on said displayed program guide; and
collecting statistics on a predetermined program attribute for at least one program corresponding to at least one of said program cells included in said designated area, wherein said a displaying device displays said designated predetermined area and said statistics.

Claim 14:

a displaying device for displaying said generated program guide on a two-dimensional screen;
an accepting device for accepting a selection of one program cell of said plurality of program cells arranged on said displayed program guide and for accepting a designation of an area including at least two program cells of said program cells on said displayed program guide,
wherein said generating device generates an information display screen based on a mode related to said display mode for displaying said selected program cell;
a collecting device for collecting statistics on a predetermined program attribute for at least one program corresponding to at least one of said program cells included in said designated area,
wherein said a displaying device displays said information display screen, said designated predetermined area, and said statistics.

As discussed during the telephonic interview, the Examiner conceded in the Office Action that Otsuki and Eble failed to disclose the collection and display of statistical information. Alexander fails to make up for this deficiency because Alexander fails to disclose any display of statistical information. Therefore, Applicant requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 09/981,257

The Examiner has rejected claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Otsuki. Applicant traverses these rejections because Otsuki fails to disclose at least the following limitations:

Claim 15:

a display that simultaneously displays the first program cell and the second program cell in the program guide, that the displays a first visual indication that indicates that the first program cell is assigned to the first priority, and that the displays a second visual indication that indicates that the second program cell is assigned to the second priority

Claim 15 comprises a display that simultaneously displays first and second program cells in a program guide and that displays first and second visual indications that respectively indicate that the first program cell is assigned to a first priority and that the second program cell is assigned to a second priority. Otsuki fails to suggest at least these features.

The Examiner cites to col. 6, lines 1-7, col. 3, lines 10-26 and figure 8 to support the rejections. However, none of these excerpts disclose or suggest the display of two different cells with two different assigned priorities. Therefore, claim 15, and dependent claims 16 and 17, are patentable.

The Examiner has rejected claims 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otsuki. Applicant traverses these rejections. These claims depend from claim 15; therefore, they should be allowable at least based on their dependence from claim 15 for the reasons described above.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 09/981,257

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl J. Pellegrini
Registration No. 40,766

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 23, 2005

Attorney Docket No.: Q66741